

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

+ + + + +

MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

+ + + + +

OCS RENEWABLE ENERGY AND
ALTERNATIVE USE PROGRAMMATIC EIS

+ + + + +

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY
MAY 25, 2006

+ + + + +

COURTYARD LONG BEACH DOWNTOWN
500 EAT FIRST STREET
LONG BEACH, CA

MODERATOR

BOB MOORE

PANEL:

JOAN BARMINSKI

SANDY BUTTERFIELD

LYNNETTE VESCO

MAURICE HILL

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

7:00 P.M.

MS. PARKS: My name is Mary Jane Parks. I am with Aqua Energy Group. We are a Seattle-based developer. I have a question for Maurice about how you would foresee working with existing State Agencies that already have fairly strong jurisdiction in California. For example, the California Coastal Commission.

MR. HILL: Sure. We would work closely with all the State Agencies, State, Federal and Local Agencies in the review of any project that's located on the Federal Outer Continental Shelf. And with respect to the California Coastal Commission, they would be involved through the federal consistency review process. And we would work closely with them definitely. Does that answer your question?

MS. PARKS: Yes. So, with consistencies -- the Clear Water Act also?

MR. HILL: Yes. Absolutely. Environmental Protection Agency if there is -- if there is an MPDS type permit involved in that. You know, as we do our NEPA Analysis, we would ask Federal and State Agencies to be cooperating Agencies in that process and to work closely with us as we put together

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the NEPA documents.

2 MR. MOORE: Any follow-up?

3 MS. PARKS: Another question if you don't
4 mind?

5 MR. MOORE: No, I don't mind at all.

6 MS. PARKS: This is for Sandy. Mary Jane
7 Parks again. You mention that in the short term, that
8 off shore wind would have faster commercial
9 development in shallow -- was is shallow water -- it
10 would? Does that mean State waters in California or
11 is that -- that's what you would consider shallow
12 water. Is that in Federal waters. What is the
13 definition.

14 MR. BUTTERFIELD: I think there is shallow
15 water both in State and in Federal waters. For
16 example, Cape Wind is very shallow water, and that's
17 in Federal water. But, obviously, there is -- as you
18 get close to the Coast -- that's where water
19 necessarily has to get shallow. So, I haven't
20 differentiated. I've simply said -- the economics
21 favor shallow water and close to shore.

22 And, so, whenever there is an opportunity
23 for a developer to look at a variety of sites, they
24 will choose a site that's as close as they can, but in
25 shallow water. Now, I think that there is also other

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 considerations that might push them further away. For
2 example, in Cape Wind's case, I think it was they are
3 outside of State -- the three-mile limit -- State
4 limit, and I can't tell you all of the reasons that
5 they chose that; but I am sure some of them are
6 economical. I really wasn't trying to say anything
7 about jurisdiction. I was really only saying the
8 economics favor shallow water and close to shore.

9 And in California, there is not much
10 shallow water. I mean we define shallow water as
11 something as water depths less than 20 meters.

12 MS. PARKS: Well, I guess my follow-up
13 would be -- I mean just in general -- does the Mineral
14 Management Service foresee off shore wind playing a
15 short-term role in California?

16 MR. HILL: We haven't heard of any
17 proposals yet off of California. But that doesn't
18 mean to say that we won't get them. As Sandy said, it
19 depends on water depth. And, you know, over the next
20 five to seven years, in waters greater than three
21 miles off shore, that's fairly deep.

22 MR. MOORE: Anyone else have any
23 questions? All right. There will be an opportunity
24 to comment formally later. Please state your name and
25 organization you represent.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. BELL: Okay. My name is Benjamin
2 Bell. I work for Clipper Wind Power in Carpenteria,
3 California. I had a question for you Mr. Moore. With
4 your experience in the Bureau of Land Management, what
5 similarities do you see between this process and say
6 sighting wind turbines on BLM Land on shore?

7 MR. MOORE: Interesting. You probably are
8 aware that the Argonne National Laboratory recently
9 completed a Programmatic Environmental Impact
10 Statement for on-shore wind energy development for the
11 Bureau of Land Management, and the action -- the
12 proposed action there -- was to amend Land Use Plans
13 for the Bureau of Land Management to either allow
14 consideration of proposals for wind energy development
15 or specifically to not allow them.

16 And that was after an examination of areas
17 that would be suitable for wind energy development in
18 the first place; and, obviously, places where they are
19 not suitable either because of the wind or because of
20 things like designated wilderness.

21 So, it was a -- 54 Land Use Plans were
22 amended to provide specific zoning allocations for or
23 against wind energy development. And what the purpose
24 of that was -- was to enable people a more streamlined
25 approach to submitting wind energy development

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 proposals on lands under BLM jurisdiction. That's not
2 to say they just have a free pass, but it would make
3 a more straightforward process. And that's much like
4 what's going on here is to prepare a Programmatic
5 Environmental Impact Statement to address the high
6 level issues associated with renewable energy
7 development off shore; so that proposals that come
8 forward can tier off of that and go forward.

9 MR. BELL: Thank you.

10 MR. MOORE: You surprised me. Any other
11 questions? You have another question?

12 MS. PARKS: If I am allowed.

13 MR. MOORE: You can have all the questions
14 you like. But limit them to three minutes because we
15 have a lot of people here.

16 MS. PARKS: What is the average permitting
17 time for an on-shore wind project?

18 MR. HILL: I can't answer that question
19 actually. Sandy, do you know?

20 MR. BUTTERFIELD: I don't think I can
21 answer that question either. I bet Ben Bell could
22 answer that question.

23 MR. BELL: [Speaking Away From Mic]

24 MR. MOORE: Would you mind stating your
25 answer again. This is fun.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. BELL: My name is Benjamin Bell. I'm
2 with Clipper Wind Power out of Carpenteria,
3 California. And the answer to the question is,
4 generally, our Land Based Applications -- it could
5 take two to three years. It's very site specific,
6 however. Projects in Texas, for example, can be
7 permitted in a very short term; whereas, obviously,
8 projects like Cape Wind where they are trying to
9 develop that, they have taken over five years trying
10 to develop it.

11 MR. HILL: I will just point out that the
12 Cape Wind Project was proceeding prior to the passage
13 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

14 MR. MOORE: Anymore questions? Well, we
15 are about to come to the time when we start talking
16 about scoping comments and providing comments to us
17 about what you think this project ought to look like
18 and what kind of things you would like Minerals
19 Management Service to look at in the preparation of a
20 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

21 As Maurice said, public scoping started
22 with the publication of a Notice of Intent in the
23 Federal Register on May 5th, and scoping will continue
24 for 60 days until July 5th -- the draft EIS coming out
25 in February. Further comments, opportunities to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

comment now, scoping comments -- not only here in Public Meetings -- but also on the Web, by mail, comment cards, a variety of ways during this Public Scoping period, and then when the draft Environmental Impact Statement comes out, there will be an opportunity to review the analysis of the proposal and the rule and to provide comments back to Minerals Management Service for another 60-day period.

And at that time, we will have something tangible to look at in terms of analysis of what we think might happen with these various kinds of development and provide a more significant opportunity to address those analyses with you recommendations on how they could be made better; where some errors might have been made or something else.

So, it's a very significant opportunity to contribute to the analysis by reviewing the draft and submitting comments. And the thing we are going to provide here is the opportunity to come forward and [microphone feedback] -- that's called the Operator behind the microphone doing that -- that's me -- and come forward and provide us with your comments on the Environmental Impact Statement. And, once again, there are more ways to do that than speaking here tonight.

And I just want to -- one more time --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 remind you of those. The most convenient way to make
2 comments for us right now is on our website. And,
3 once again, on the poster over here on the side, shows
4 you those ways to comment. You can check that out
5 after the slide is off the screen and before you
6 leave. It's also in the handout material that you
7 were provided.

8 Certainly, a good way to provide comments
9 -- you were given a comment card when you signed in
10 this evening -- you can write your comments on that
11 card and hand it to us before you leave. It's a piece
12 of paper actually. We call it a card because we used
13 to produce them on card stock. And we figured what's
14 the point. Just heavier to carry around. And, also,
15 if you have a lot of things that you'd like to send us
16 -- publications, reports, work that you've done or
17 something else, you can use the address on that form
18 and simply send us the material to the address that
19 was shown there. Or, you can simply use regular mail
20 and type up your comments and send them to us that
21 way. There are a lot of ways to do it. Please use at
22 least one, and get some comments to us. We would
23 appreciate that.

24 For your remarks tonight -- and a least a
25 couple of people have signed up to provide comments to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 us this evening -- we'd like you to come up to the
2 podium, speak directly into the microphone. State
3 your name, the organization that you represent. I
4 don't have nerve enough to tell you I'm going to limit
5 your comment period time for any length of time. I
6 don't think we have that big a crowd; so, we really
7 are interested in hearing what you have to say. If
8 you have materials that you brought with you that you
9 can leave with us, please do so. We will get a
10 transcript of what you say; but if you can leave us a
11 copy of your prepared remarks or anything that you'd
12 like to add to supplement those remarks, we'd sure
13 like to have them.

14 So, the -- in the order of the -- when
15 they signed in, we will call the first speaker, Lisa
16 Goldy. Hubb Sea World Research Institute. You have
17 to get pretty close to that microphone.

18 MS. GOLDY: I'll do my best. Okay. My
19 name is Lisa Goldy, and I represent Hubb Sea World
20 Research Institute. Hubb Sea World Research Institute
21 submitted comments to the Minerals Management Service
22 Rules Processing Team on February 28, 2006, in
23 response to the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rule
24 Making published by the Minerals Management Service on
25 December 30, 2005. This development of a new program

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 under Section 388 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005
2 authorizes the MMS to issue leases for the use of
3 current or former energy production facilities on the
4 outer-continental shelf for other authorized Marine-
5 related purposes.

6 Our Institute would further offer that
7 most Aquaculture in the United States is conducted at
8 shore-based or near-shore facilities. Expansion
9 within these areas is limited by poor water quality,
10 commercial and recreational development and use.
11 Expansion of U.S. Aquaculture, therefore, must include
12 OCS waters. Locating Aquaculture in the OCS provides
13 substantial benefit, including large volumes of water
14 to support large scale production, excellent water
15 quality to promote seafood health and a geographic
16 remoteness that minimizes user conflicts.

17 In this context, existing oil and gas
18 production platforms provide an ideal setting, as well
19 as significant infrastructure support, for off-shore
20 seafood production. Hubb Sea World Research Institute
21 wishes to express its gratitude to the MMS for
22 allowing us to comment, and we would further offer our
23 help in developing rules that would govern the use of
24 off-shore platforms for the support of Aquaculture.
25 And thank you so much. I appreciate it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. MOORE: Thank you. Our next speaker
2 is Mary Jane Parks.

3 MS. PARKS: Hello, my name is Mary Jane
4 Parks. I'm with Aqua Energy Group of Mercer Island,
5 Washington. We would like to provide some written
6 comments subsequent to this public meeting; however,
7 in the interest of supporting the Programmatic EIS, I
8 thought I would like to make an oral comment. Aqua
9 Energy Group is currently in the permitting process of
10 the Macabe Washington Off-Shore Pilot Project. It's
11 an off-shore wave energy project using four buoys that
12 would develop about one megawatt of electricity and
13 deliver to the grid using Sub-CE Cable.

14 So, we have pioneered the permitting
15 process for off-shore wave energy in the United
16 States, working with nine agencies for a quasi-
17 commercial power plant. There have been other permits
18 issued to off-share energy, but they haven't gone
19 through a commercial permitting process as Aqua Energy
20 has, and we are almost completed with our preliminary
21 draft Environmental Assessment. So, I just offer that
22 so that Aqua Energy would be available to provide
23 advice or other comment to your Programmatic EIS.

24 After having listened to your presentation
25 today, also as a Citizen of the United States, I would

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 just say -- run and develop your EIS. Because we have
2 such a strong need for renewables. We have a global
3 warming issue that we need to address in this country,
4 and I hope that the Minerals Management Service will
5 get as much Federal and State support to develop a
6 streamlined permitting process so that we can help
7 develop these sectors and get them on their way to
8 commercial development as quickly and as
9 environmentally sound as possible.

10 A couple of specifics I would like to say
11 on your Programmatic EIS, whether or not you are going
12 to address the impact of replacement of traditional
13 power; that is, are you going to have as an advantage
14 the removal of greenhouse gas emissions as a benefit
15 and address some of those benefits in terms of air and
16 water quality impacts? Are you going to address and
17 have an expected timeline of scoping meetings and the
18 review by Agencies in the Programmatic EIS?

19 For instance, if your EIS schedule is to
20 be completed in 16 months, is that a good rule of
21 thumb that a developer could expect to have their EIS
22 completed within that timeframe or less? And how are
23 you going to address, perhaps, competing permit
24 applications for the same -- generally the same --
25 area. Is it going to be first come, first served?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Are you going to allot different megawatt developments
2 for those different five alternative uses? How are
3 you going to address permitting applications? And
4 maybe our comment might be -- once a permit
5 application is submitted, there must be a specific
6 time period in which construction or permitting
7 application, I guess, first must be followed
8 thereafter.

9 And also, I just had a question about what
10 you had placed up there -- a bullet -- alternatives to
11 the project. What -- if you could define what
12 alternatives to the projects would be -- because if
13 the Programmatic EIS is only for looking at those five
14 alternative uses or areas, what do you mean by
15 alternatives to the project? Does that mean not
16 having them at all, which would be tragic?

17 I think that concludes my comments. Thank
18 you.

19 MR. MOORE: Thank you very much. Did you
20 have anything you can leave wit us? Or will you be
21 sending materials to us?

22 MS. PARKS: Well, I can send them.

23 MR. MOORE: Thank you. Anyone else have
24 nay comments? It wasn't a requirement to say you were
25 going to have comments when you signed in. And if you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 thought about it and changed your mind and would like
2 t provide us with some formal comments, we would
3 really appreciate it. Any takers? Great opportunity.
4 Okay. Anybody else have anymore questions? Panel
5 have any questions for anyone? Can anybody think of
6 a reason why we ought to keep staying here?

7 MR. HILL: I do have a couple of comments
8 I would like to make. Bob, I think you covered this,
9 but regardless of how you make your comments, whether
10 it is tonight or whether it's on the comment card, in
11 writing or on the website, all comments will be
12 treated the same way.

13 So, just be aware of that. July 5th is
14 the deadline for those comments. And, also, you'd be
15 interested in knowing that all the comments that we do
16 receive in the scoping process are, of course, being
17 recorded by the Court Reporter here, and they will all
18 be posted on our website as soon as we can, plus our
19 guy in National Lab is preparing for us a Scoping
20 Report from all the Scoping Meetings that we're
21 holding in the country, and there are nine other
22 Scoping Meetings that we're holding. Our next two on
23 the West Coast will be in Portland on June 6th and in
24 San Francisco on June 8th.

25 So, if there are no further comments, I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 will close this Public Scoping Meeting. Thank you
2 very much for your attendance.

3 (Whereupon, at 8:00 p.m., the meeting was
4 adjourned.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25